



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,633	12/17/2003	Seoung Cheoun Kim	SI-0049	3828

34610 7590 10/13/2005

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP  
P.O. BOX 221200  
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER
----------

TAYLOR, BARRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/736,633

Applicant(s)

KIM, SEOUNG CHEOUN

Examiner

Barry W. Taylor

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8,10,12 and 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10,12 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants own admittance in view of O'Neil et al (4,296,282 hereinafter O'Neil) in view of Lee (5,859,903) further in view of Nakamura (6,535,595).

Regarding claim 1. Applicants admitted prior art teaches a call pick-up system (see Applicants figure 1) of a switching device, comprising:

a subscriber call process block (see item 11 figure 1) for performing a call pick-up function in the switching device.

Applicants disclose that prior art call pick-up systems do not use a caller information analysis block (see Applicants specification paragraphs 16 and 56, see difference between prior art (i.e. figure 1) and Applicants claimed invention (i.e. figure 3) is item 65 now appearing in figure 3 which is labeled "Caller information analysis block").

O'Neil also teaches a call pick arrangement (title, abstract, column 1) wherein each station can answer another stations call belonging to same group (col. 1 lines 5-35, col. 4 line 63 – col. 5 line 31). O'Neil discloses using caller identification information

Art Unit: 2643

enables the answering party to know who the caller is, as well as, the identity of the originally called station that is unavailable to take call (col. 1 lines 5-35).

It would have been obvious to any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of O'Neil into the teachings of Applicants admitted prior art in order to notify the person answering the call who the original called station was thereby eliminating the confusion as disclosed by O'Neil (col. 1 lines 24-35).

O'Neil does not explicitly teaches caller information table includes the caller information and the subscriber telephone number and assigns a unique identifier number to each caller's number.

Lee teaches a caller identification method in a call pick-up system (abstract) wherein name and message from caller is displayed (column 1), as well as, displaying a caller identification on a display device in case when a caller from an office line hangs up the call (col. 1 lines 15-25, col. 2 lines 15-29). Lee also uses a unique identifier (see "#1" in table 1, column 3 assigned to the name "Lee Jung Sung" and telephone number "321-7654") to store caller identification information so that subscribers can retrieve at a later time (col. 4 line 30 – col. 6 line 67) or redial by simple press of dial key.

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Lee into the teachings of Applicants admitted prior art in view of O'Neil in order to provide a more user-friendly system that allows subscribers the ability to redial by simple press of button.

According to Applicants (see paper dated 7/25/05, newly amended claims and page 9 line 3) O'Neil in view of Lee fail to teach a call information table, instead O'Neil in view of Lee only display one caller number at a time.

Nakamura also teaches a busy line display method wherein plurality of line names are displayed (title, abstract). Nakamura uses unique identifiers (see '200', '201', '202', '203', '204', '300', '301' in figure 8) to display line(s) status for different groups of lines (columns 1-2, see different groups having unique identifiers '200', '201', '202', '203', '204', '300', '301' in figure 8) making it easier for user to determine line status by using only one display.

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Nakamura into the teachings of O'Neil in view of Lee in order to divide lines into groups so that they can collectively be displayed on one display as taught by Nakamura.

Regarding claims 2 and 6. O'Neil teaches using caller identification to identify both the calling and called stations (abstract, col. 1 lines 5-35).

Regarding claim 4. Applicants admit that prior art already teaches a call process common block (item 11 figure 1 of Applicants disclosure);

a digit analysis block (see item 13 figure 1 of Applicants disclosure and paragraph 4):

a ring search block (see item 14 figure 1 of Applicants disclosure and paragraph 5); and

a LCD control block (see item 12 figure 1 of Applicants disclosure and paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 5. Claim 5 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 4 since claim 5 is the combination of claims 1 and 4.

Method claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as system claims 1 and 5 since the recited apparatus would perform the claimed method steps.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. Claims 10, 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5 and 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W. Taylor, telephone number (571) 272-7509, who is available Monday-Friday, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached at (571) 272-7499. The central facsimile phone number for this group is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Art Unit: 2643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Centralized Delivery Policy: For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the central fax number (571-273-8300).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Barry W. Taylor", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Barry W. Taylor  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2600  
Art Unit 2643